

REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for polling a first master transmitting device with a second master transmitting device "to determine a hopping sequence of the first master transmitting device."

In support of the proposition that the cited reference does such a thing, paragraph 23, last four lines are cited. Those lines are as follows:

The request for assistance message is preferably directed to all neighbor NAPs and includes the ID for the NAP requesting service as well as the schedule for the CU 111.

The ID is explained in paragraph 18. The ID determines a unique frequency hopping pattern of a master.

The reason why the above cited material does not teach what is claimed is that a second master does not poll a first master to determine the hopping sequence of the first master. Instead, in the cited reference, one master broadcasts its hopping sequence (or in the language of the cited reference, "the ID for the NAP requesting service"). Thus, the broadcast hopping sequence is the wrong one (so far as the claim is concerned) in the cited reference. A second master does not ask a first master for the first master's hopping sequence. The master broadcasts its hopping sequence. Therefore, the reference does not teach polling a first master transmitting device with a second master transmitting device to determine a hopping sequence of the first master transmitting device.

Further, the claim calls for "wherein polling the first master transmitting device includes determining whether the first master transmitting device is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device." Here, all that happens is one master transmits its ID to all neighbor masters. There is no determination of whether the first master (i.e. the master being polled by a second master) is receiving a signal from a slave transmitting device. In this case, the master that is broadcasting its ID is the one that is, in fact, deciding to cut off communications with the CU.

There is no determining whether one of the neighboring NAPs is communicating with a slave transmitting device because, most likely, it is not. That is the whole problem. The master that is communication with the CU does not want to continue communicating and is apparently hoping that a neighboring NAP can take over the communication with the CU.


Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

The same problem arises with respect to claim 14. A first master is notified of the hopping sequence of the slave with the second master. Then, the first master is polled from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device. There is no such determination in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Claim 23 calls for polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave. This, too, does not happen in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2008



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation